

Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000
Public Law 106-393
Title II Project Submission Form
Northeast Oregon Forests Resource Advisory
Committee

1. Project Number (Assigned by Designated Federal Official): GR-MAL04-121

2. Project Name: Canyon Creek Thinning and Fuels Reduction	3. County: Grant
4. Project Sponsor: Mike Montgomery	5. Date: 11-14-2002
6. Sponsor's Phone Number: 541-575-3401	
7. Sponsors E-mail: mmontgomery02@fs.fed.us	

8. Project Location (attach project area map)	
a. 4 th Field Watershed Name and HUC #: Canyon Creek Watershed 1707020108	
b. 5 th Field Watershed Name and HUC # (if known): Lower East Creek (07), Sugarloaf (13), Fawn (15), Vance Creek (17)	
c. Location: Township <u>15S</u> Range <u>31E</u> Section(s) <u>1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12</u> Township <u>15S</u> Range <u>32E</u> Section(s) <u>16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34</u> Township <u>16S</u> Range <u>32E</u> Section(s) <u>3</u> Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____ Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____ Township _____ Range _____ Section(s) _____	
d. BLM District	e. BLM Resource Area
f. National Forest: Malheur	g. Forest Service District: Blue Mountain
h. State / Private / Other lands involved? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives: (max. 7 lines) Reduce fuels by thinning overstocked stands within about one mile of private lands in the Canyon Creek Watershed, treating slash and excess dead wood. Wildfire intensity would be reduced allowing better protection of private property. Forest health would be improved resulting in the reduction of the risk of stands being attacked by bark beetles. Small diameter wood products would be produced creating local employment opportunities in addition to the work of cutting trees and treating slash. This project meets the goals and objectives of the National Fire Plan and is part of the Business Plan developed in cooperation with other government agencies including Grant County and businesses.
--

10. Project Description: (max. 30 lines.) The following description in quotes is from the Restoration Business Plan for the Malheur National Forest. "Review of the Malheur National Forest System Lands by Forest fire planning staff shows that the Canyon Creek area is clearly the highest priority area on the Forest from a wildland and inter-mix fire standpoint. To initiate this business plan, areas within the Canyon Creek Watershed were selected for contract environmental analysis and biological evaluation in 2003. The intent is to use

Title III and National Fire Plan dollars to complete the NEPA and biological evaluation. In 2004, the intent is to use Forest appropriated dollars along with requested dollars from Title II program to complete the work in Canyon Creek.”

Treatment acres will not be known until the planning is done. It is estimated that about 600 acres of forest stands would be available for treatment that would not be suitable for commercial timber sales due to the large amount of small trees. However, there would be some trees large enough to be utilized for post, poles, small saw timber, fire wood and chips.

Treatments include cutting of the smaller trees, working up in size until the prescribed stocking is obtained (thinning from below). Species preference will also be a factor in selecting trees to leave. The more fire resistant ponderosa pine trees will be favored to leave over other species that are more prone to torch and be killed by fire. Tree spacing will vary depending on tree size but will be as wide as possible while still being above minimum stocking levels established by the Forest Service. This wide spacing will provide for the longest period of fire hazard reduction and allow for the fastest tree growth. Cut trees are to be removed depending on tree size, accessibility and terrain. Otherwise, the slash will be piled for later burning. Dead woody material will also be treated to a level of low fire hazard. Tree cutting and slash treatment would be done by contract.

11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s) on adjacent lands?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, then describe (max. 10 lines)

12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation? [Sec. 203(b)(1)]
<input type="checkbox"/> Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure. [Sec. 2(b)]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems. [Sec. 2(b)]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)]
<input type="checkbox"/> Restores water quality. [Sec. 2(b)]

13. Project Type (check one) [Sec. 203(b)(1)]	
<input type="checkbox"/> Road Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]	<input type="checkbox"/> Trail Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]
<input type="checkbox"/> Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]	<input type="checkbox"/> Trail Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]	
<input type="checkbox"/> Soil Productivity Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest Health Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)]
<input type="checkbox"/> Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]	<input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]
<input type="checkbox"/> Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]	<input type="checkbox"/> Control of Noxious Weeds [Sec. 2(b)(2)(F)]
<input type="checkbox"/> Reestablish Native Species [Sec. 2(b)(2)(G)]	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Project Type (specify) [Sec. 2(b)(2)]:	

14. Measure of Project Accomplishments/Expected Outcomes [Sec. 203(b)(5)]	
a. Total Acres: 600	b. Total Miles:
c. No. Structures:	d. Est. People Reached
e. No. Laborer Days:	(for environmental education projects):
f. Other (specify):	

15. Estimated Completion Date: [Sec. 203(b)(2)] 09-30-2004

16. Target Species Benefited: (if applicable) (max. 7 lines) N/A

17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved? [Sec. 2(b)(3)] (max. 12 lines)

Thinning with emphasis on retaining the larger trees generally has support from groups with differing views on the management of the National Forests. Project design is important to meet resource needs, such as cover for wildlife, and the planning process to be done in 2003 will be used to gain support for the project through public participation.

18. How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] **Identify benefits to communities.** (max. 12 lines)

The treatment area is within the dry forest type that historically had widely spaced trees and was resistant to stand replacing wildfires. The project helps to bring the ecosystem back towards historical conditions while reducing wildfire hazards and producing forest products providing economic benefits. Private land and structures can be better protected from wildfire with increased safety to land owners and fire fighters when fuels are reduced adjacent to the properties. Primary (contract cutting) and secondary employment (forest products processing) opportunities are created.

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources? (max. 12 lines)

In addition to the resource benefits mentioned above, reduced tree stocking will improve grasses and shrubs through increased sunlight. This will improve condition of forage, benefiting wildlife and cattle Grazing as well as maintaining a diverse native plant community. More precipitation will be able to reach the ground and that can increase the amount of snow pack.

20. Status of Project Planning

a. NEPA Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
If no, give est. date of completion:			
c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
e. Survey & Manage Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
h. SHPO* Concurrence Received:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
i. Project Design(s) Completed:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
* DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, COE = Army Corps of Engineers, SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer			

21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment (check those that apply)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract	<input type="checkbox"/> Federal Workforce
<input type="checkbox"/> County Workforce	<input type="checkbox"/> Volunteers
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):	

22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable Materials? [Sec. 204(e)(3)]

☒ Yes ☐ No

23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]	
a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$285,120	
b. Is this a multi-year funding request? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, then display by fiscal year	
c. FY02 Request:	f. FY05 Request:
d. FY03 Request:	g. FY06 Request:
e. FY04 Request: \$285,120	

Table 1. Project Cost Analysis

Item	Column A Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column B Requested County Title II Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column C Other Contributions [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column D Total Available Funds
24. Field Work & Site Surveys		\$4,000		\$4,000
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation	\$50,000		\$50,000	\$100,000
26. Permit Acquisition				
27. Project Design & Engineering	\$6,000			\$6,000
28. Contract Preparation		\$4,000		\$4,000
29. Contract Administration		\$9,000		\$9,000
30. Contract Cost		\$240,000		\$240,000
31. Workforce Cost				
32. Materials & Supplies		\$3,000		\$3,000
33. Monitoring		\$4,000		\$4,000
34. Other (i.e. Section 106 Compliance)				
35. Project Sub-Total	\$56,000	\$264,000	\$50,000	\$370,000
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead @ 8%) (per year for multi-year projects)	\$14,672 (26.2%)	\$21,120		\$35,792
37. Total Cost Estimate	\$70,672	\$285,120	\$50,000	\$405,792

38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)] (max. 7 lines)

Additional acres for treatment will probably be identified during the planning process. These would be financed with Forest Service funds. The overall result would be a larger project that will be cost shared. Most or some of the additional treatment may be feasible with commercial timber sale.

Grant County is a contributor of \$50,000 from Title III funds for the NEPA planning in 2003.

39. Monitoring Plan [Sec. 203(b)(6)]

- a. **What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions?** [Sec. 203(b)(6)] (max. 7 lines)

Who is responsible for this monitoring item?: During thinning, the contractor will be responsible for the quality control of their operation. Thinning plot inspection cards, including tree count, will be filled out by the contractor. The government inspectors will review a sample of the contractor's plots. Additional stand data is collected by the government inspector. The fuel treatment is inspected by the government in order to determine if the objective has been met.

- b. **How will the project be evaluated to determine how well the proposed project contributes towards local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps?** [Sec. 203(b)(6)] (max. 7 lines)

Who is responsible for this monitoring item?: Public Law 106-291, which provides for enhancement of local and small business employment opportunities in rural communities, has been incorporated into government contract solicitations.

- c. **What methods and measures of evaluation will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from National Forest System lands consistent with the purposes of this Act?** [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] (max. 7 lines)

Who is responsible for this monitoring item?: The contractor can be issued product removal load tickets and the number of tickets used will indicate the amount of material utilized.

- d. **Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, Item 33)**
(max. 7 lines)

Amount **\$4,000**

Project Name:

County Court Concurrence

(Majority Required per charter)

A majority of the county commissioners of Grant County have reviewed this proposed Public Law 106-393 project for the Grant County Advisory Council and agree with the proposal as submitted, except for the comments noted below:

Attested by Grant County Judge

Date

Priority Rating:

☐ High ☐ Medium ☐ Low

Comments/Rational:

Project Name:

County Commissioner Concurrence

This proposed Public Law 106-393 project to be presented to the Northeast Oregon Forest Resource Advisory Committee has been reviewed by the Harney County Court (or representative thereof). This County Court agrees with the proposal as submitted, except for the comments noted below:

Attested by Harney County Judge/Commissioner

Date

Priority Rating:

X High ☐ Medium ☐ Low

Comments/Rational: